

**REDMOND PARK BOARD**  
*Minutes*  
**October 7, 2004**  
**Old Redmond Schoolhouse Community Center**

**I. Call to order**

The regular meeting of the Redmond Park Board was called to order by Chairperson Lori Snodgrass at 7:02 p.m.

Board members present: Chair Lori Snodgrass, Seth Kelsey, David Degenstein, Ann Callister, David Ladd, Hank Margeson, Sue Stewart, and Youth Advocates; Katherine Zak and Larissa Jones.

City staff present: Danny Hopkins, Parks and Recreation Director; Timothy Cox, Park Planning Manager; Tom Trueblood, Recreation Manager; Marty Boggs, Recreation Fitness and Fields Coordinator; Jeff Hagen, Sports and Fitness Supervisor, Eric O'Neal, Park Operations Supervisor; Jill Smith, Special Events Coordinator; Ken Bechmann, Trails Commission Co-Chair; and Sharon Sato, Recording Secretary.

Welcome to Hank Margeson, new Park Board member. Margeson has lived in Redmond for 11½ years, involved in youth sports - LWYSA coach and RBA. His wife and daughter are avid horseback rider and trail users. His wife is an RBA Board member.

Welcome to Larrissa Jones, new youth advocate. Jones is a senior at Redmond High School, a member of the Bellevue Youth Symphony, vice-president of the Redmond Honor Society, and has an interest in government.

Welcome to Ken Bechmann, Trails Commission Co-Chair. Bechmann is representing the Commission with comments on the Trust for Public Lands agenda item discussion.

**II. Approval of Minutes**

The Redmond Park Board minutes of September 2, 2004 were approved as presented:

**Motion for approval of the September 2, 2004 Redmond Park Board minutes as amended.**

**Motion by:** Degenstein

**Second by:** Callister

**Motion carried:** 7-0 unanimous

### **III. Items from the Audience**

Rick Loya, Redmond resident - Question to the Board regarding the Par Course (fitness equipment along the Sammamish River Trail, along side of City Hall) which is no longer on the City Campus site and its possible replacement. Cox addressed the question with some background of the City's plan for the development of the new Municipal Campus. Loya noted that this equipment was well utilized and its location, near the trail, made it a great additional amenity.

Cox noted that with citizen interest/input and with Board support, this information will be incorporated into the Draft Park Master Plan for further possible consideration.

#### Introduction of new staff - Tom Trueblood/Jeff Hagen

Introduction by Hagen of the two newest members of the Recreation staff - Marty Boggs, Fitness and Fields Coordinator; Jill Smith, Special Events Coordinator.

Boggs has worked for Redmond 3 years at the Community Center, worked for Bellevue for 10 years in their Sr. program.

Smith has 15 years of events planning experience, working with the business community and will focus on building Redmond's corporate relationships. Smith will be working on RedmondLights, Derby Days and other events held by the City.

### **IV. Additions to the Agenda/Handouts**

- Designs for Safer Parks (Handout)

Item so noted in the Municipal Campus Master Plan. Key issue in the planning of the new campus - safety. No current State or Federal guidelines/regulations, however, safety has been discussed at the City's Technical Committee level; includes Fire, Public Works, Planning, Parks, and other city departments.

**V. OLD BUSINESS**

**A. Municipal Campus Master Plan –**

Final text was not submitted. Cox reported that at a recent Study Session City Council reviewed select aspects of the city hall project, one of which was the Municipal Campus Master Plan – Hewett and Associates were present to answer questions and provide updates. Adoption by Park Board is hopefully planned for next month.

Hopkins noted that Council was in agreement with the Board's recommendations. Council did have some questions about parking and how the buildings themselves would impact the campus versus the park concept. The park concept was embraced by Council. Preliminary cost estimates were given as \$10 - \$12 million dollars, depending on timing, materials and many other factors.

Staff encourages Park Board members to comment on text or any other aspects of the plan. Staff noted that the draft was approximately 80% to completion, with 20% more to add; safety as being one item that needs further addressing and further description on specific types of features used to activate park space. Potential to address/introduce campus activities.

Degenstein reiterated on his request from last month pertaining to a list of estimated first phase contents to site – furniture (park benches, picnic tables, etc.). Phase II inventory list has been identified. Staff will pursue further, the Board's request.

The Board requests the possible reinstallation of the Par Fitness Course as part of Phase I planning of the Municipal Campus Master Plan. Kelsey requested that Hewitt give their recommendation to the best, most effective and efficient quantities and location placement of the Par Course.

Zak requested that designers take into consideration, any future phasing design that might require the relocation the Par Course costing the City more money.

Motion by Callister:

For the Park Board to make a motion to direct staff to ask designers to include the Par Course in Phase I and include costs to Park Board.

No further discussion. Second by Ladd.  
Motion carried: 7-0

Staff will provide Board with pertinent information on the planning and placement of Phase II amenities. Staff will also look into whether the Par Course is on the equipment replacement list or where funding would come from.

B. Trust for Public Lands (TPL) – Adam Eichberg

Eichberg addressed the Board on the preparation of recommendation to Council on a funding measure. Ikeburg had primarily two topics he wanted to address:

- 1) Background Questions that will direct preparation of a citizen survey
- 2) Timing – Due to this election year, waiting until the first of the year to put a survey into the field for voters. Looking at spring, likely fall or early 2006, giving staff time to prepare a “cleaner/clearer” presentation.

Eichberg's goal for this meeting is to – take information from meeting, get the survey consultant in place and get a first draft of the survey done as soon as possible.

Visiting Trails Commissioner, Ken Bechmann stated that the Trails Commission had reviewed the Public Opinion Survey Background Research and the Commission had some questions.

- 1) Was the Survey Background Research a candidate to be refined as a survey for the public. Ikeburg responded no; the point being to solicit feedback from Board and Commission as to the design of the final questionnaire that would be distributed to the public. These background questions need to be answered in order to draft the first survey.
- 2) First draft will be done, staff will review it for accuracy. Discussion items from meetings have been included and the draft survey will be reviewed by Park Board
- 3) Do Board members want a smaller sub-committee of Board review the drafts of the surveys as they progress with final Board approval. Hopkins noted that he is concerned about good communication and

adequate public disclosure. Trails Commission members would like to be included as part of the comment groups. Board members agreed to a representative from Trails, Arts and two to four Board members. Callister, Kelsey, and Ladd will be part of the sub-committee.

Cox attempted to clarify the background questions from TPL. Cox noted that there are no wrong answers to these questions. Broad interpretation of each question will provide variety and diversity of answers. Success on measures is acumen on the broadest interpretation of values.

Hopkins noted that survey responses could to be general and address tendencies, trends and emerging issues.

- 4) Public survey will answer three basic questions – Point of Survey:
  - A) What funding mechanism is the public most interested in?
  - B) At What Level?
  - C) What Purposes and Projects?

First Draft of the Survey will address:

- First question – Funding mechanism – no bias to other questions, what for, arguments, etc. (Do you think Redmond is going the right way or wrong way?)
- Different levels within that funding mechanism
- List of things that funding can go for – parks, habitat, trails, active parks, etc. Best description of what needs to be done in order to generate the best support?
- Series of logic and analysis in support and opposition of a measure
- List of people, agencies, groups in favor of additional funding – what type of coalition does the City need to build in order to support this measure within the community before it moves forward.

Public Opinion Survey Background Research Questions

- 1) What would be the strongest argument for and against a public program for land conservation and parks in Redmond?

In favor

- Increasing demands on our infrastructures, not enough to go around
- Save land from development
- Budgets to do projects
- Preservation of Redmond's environment, safe drinking water, clean air, quality of life style (Safe drinking water is the #1 priority around country in support of resource measures.)
- Balance of green space with development

Against

- Over taxed
- Condition of the economy
- City Hall costs
- NIMBY – (Not in my back yard)
- Traffic
- No direct benefit
- Over saturation – perception that there are already too many parks and recreation facilities/capabilities within the city

2) Skipped

- 3) Of the available funding mechanisms (utility tax, GO bonds, levy lid lift), what is likely to be the most preferred mechanism to fund a land conservation and parks program? What specific arguments could be made for or against each funding type?

General Obligation Bonds with an accompanying levy for the M&O portion. Obligation Bonds cannot be used for operation and maintenance, only for capital. Utility Tax.

GO Bond – where to start? \$10 million medium level, test up or down. Need a clean read on some number, need to calibrate starting point.

- 4) What are likely to be the most and least popular program elements (passive recreation, ball fields, playgrounds, protection of wildlife habitat, trails, maintenance and repair of city parks versus, cultural and historic features, etc.)?

Most important question. Laundry list of things to pay for with “new” money.

- Recreation center
- Aquatic center
- Open space
- Trails – all types
- Sports field – baseball, tennis, Lacrosse, Cricket, Disc Golf, soccer
- Multi-use ball fields – various field names (playfields)
- Covered tennis courts
- All weather/All season fields
- Teen Center
- Pea patch/community garden
- Off leash pet area
- Neighborhood Open Space

- 5) What other priorities could be linked to land conservation and park development in Redmond: sprawl/growth management, clean drinking water (aquifer or surface water source protection), jobs and economic growth (possible linkages could be tourism, access to public lands, biking), preservation of rural character and lifestyle, recreation programs for youth and seniors, etc?

#### Benefits

- Clean water
- Clean air
- Habitat protection
- Balance development
- Historical link – preservation of past, agricultural (pea patch)
- Access
- New dimension, diversity
- Dividing areas of recreation – physical and mental
- Gathering places/community areas
- Arts – artwork/civic
- Visual performing art - amphitheater

- 6) Skipped

- 7) What features of Redmond's landscape and parks evoke strong emotions in people? What words do people use in describing Redmond's parks and open spaces?
- Green

- Trees
- Clean
- Well maintained
- Vital
- Active
- Multi-dimensional
- Unique character - Trails system
- Greenbelt around City
- Backbone trails system
- Natural
- Friendly

Hopkins noted that Redmond has significant open space buffers form a unique "green" ring around the City (e.g. Sammamish Valley parks and agricultural land to the north, Marymoor Park and Lake Sammamish to the south and significant park and greenway properties to the east. How do we preserve that, capitalize on that with a backbone trails system.

- 8) What controversies about land use and the environment could affect this program, pro or con (growth management, property rights, public land management disputes, groundwater contamination, etc.)?

- City Hall
- Increased property tax
- Growth management

- 9) How do people feel about Redmond's government in general and its responsiveness to their needs? About the board or agency that would administer the land conservation program? How do people perceive the city's fiscal condition, debt burden, tax burden, etc.? Are there concerns about financial mismanagement?

- Previous survey support confidence
- People seem to like responsiveness
- County fees - parking, signage, hotels, more commercialized, increased fees promote fiscal concern for parks funding
- Council support for transfer of County amenities - swimming pool - NW Centers operated, partnership with LWSD - Bridal Crest Trail - Dudley Carter site positive



- Maintenance of existing and new facilities. Addition of new facilities with none or little increase in funding - concern

10) What other public spending needs might be a priority with voters? With elected officials?

- Transportation
- City Hall

11) Should the program have a defined sunset date which it must go back to voters for renewal? If so, what should be the initial term of the program (e.g. 5, 10, 15 years)?

- Board agreed there should be a "sunset" date to strive for
- Provides accountability
- Citizens have an opportunity to "review" how the Department is doing

Pollster will be chosen in the next month. Written comments will be taken week of October 11<sup>th</sup>.

C. Idylwood Playground – Rich VanderMark

VanderMark consultant for the design and development of the playground at the Park gave a presentation to the Board on the proposed play structure.

- Located in meadow area
- Tranquil
- Natural environment
- Passive
- Focus on landscape experience
- Family
- Wildlife habitat
- Neighborhood briefings/input
- Reflect lake setting
- History of park – Gateway Grove Resort
- Use of site – recreation use
- Supports Increased beach area
- Located in pocket of park entry
- Divided into two play zones – 2 to 5 yr old range (more subtle area) and 5 to 12 yr old range (more adventurous area)

- Boathouse with picnic shelter, 2 full size picnic tables
- Wheelchair accessible
- Accessible berm – eye level height, surrounding play area – keeps material onsite
- Structures have white posts with green roofs – emulate the “white wash” effect of the cabins that once were located on the site
- Large slide – Grove Gateway theme
- All materials are technically accessible, all have ADA compliance approval

Hopkins noted that staff is looking into the issue of a pervious solid surface for ADA accessibility. It would cost \$40,000 - \$70,000 more than originally planned for this project. Some determinations will be made in the future. This is dependant on funding.

VanDerMark pointed out the small accessible path that ride along top of berm that goes to the upper elevation of the structure, making both upper and lower parts of the structure easily accessible with ADA. Some sculpture is also a part of the structure to add to the natural history of the site – fish, row boat, surrounded by a concrete curve, paved accessible path from parking lot.

The Gateway Grove theme and name is carried out with a created gateway made from cross paddle and oars, aluminum sign marking the entries, with green pillars and grass berm for seating.

The Board unanimously agreed that the consultant was on the “right track” and should continue it the design direction demonstrated.

B. Annual Park Board Retreat and Project Tour

Saturday, November 13, 2004

8:30 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Fullard House

Tour at the end of the retreat day

Topics:

- Funding
- CIP/PIP review – Input on potential changes
- Vision on “wishlist”

- Polling questions

Tour Sites:

- Perrigo Park
- Undeveloped property – Juel property, park property off 116<sup>th</sup>, Johnson Park, Conrad Olson, Barrett Property
- Trail construction

Any suggestions can be e-mailed to Tim Cox at [tc Cox@redmond.gov](mailto:tc Cox@redmond.gov). Agenda will be finalized at the November meeting.

## VII. Reports – Projects

- A. Samamish Rowing Association Update – Concept of Use Agreement going to Council for their direction to proceed – next two months. Information will be given to the Park Board prior to City Council. Staff has consulted City Attorney, Jim Haney, as to the “do ability” of the project. Project has gone to Technical Committee and Design Review Board, pre-application conference.
- B. Sunset Gardens Grand Opening Dedication – Friday, October 22, 2004, 3:30 p.m. Carpooling is encouraged. Parking – Coast Guard Housing property, EHAW parking lot, visitor parking at Talliswood residential neighborhood
- C. Evan Creek Trail Construction – Trail runs south from 95<sup>th</sup> near Perrigo Park to Union Hill Road - Phase II missing link will be built in early spring, 2005.
- D. Samamish River Trail Improvements – Phase III habitat improvement, westside of Samamish River, complete within the next two months.
- E. Haida House – King County owned. King County will store Dudley Carter art pieces. Will be going to Council after King County completes review.
- F. Perrigo Park Usage – Hopkins noted that steps had been taken to alleviate the parking problems at the park – “no parking” signs had been installed to direction park patrons where to park, potential to open the Conrad Olson property for “overflow” parking – once the trail is completed, recreation scheduling has been cued to spread out switch over times to accommodate in and outgoing game traffic, information packets to educate users as to appropriate behavior and especially party sizes will be distributed.

Kelsey reiterated his previous comments regarding his objections of city owned property used for parking purposes. He is opposed to using valuable park land for parking when recreation space needs are so great. He also opposes purchasing any park land/open space for the purpose of overflow parking for any park facility. Kelsey suggested that the

availability of the Bear Creek Park and Ride is available for parking and shuttling is greatly encouraged.

G. Fireman's Plaza Art Bench Dedication – Saturday, October 25<sup>th</sup>,

#### VIII. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn: Stewart

Second by: Ladd

Approved: 7-0

Meeting adjourned at 9:07 p.m.

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Lori Snodgrass, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Minutes prepared by Recording Secretary, Sharon Sato

Next Regular Meeting

November 4, 2004

7:00 p.m.

Location: Old Redmond Schoolhouse Community Center